

Remarks

Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims correspond to a single unified inventive concept, and that the basis for restriction set forth in the Office Action is flawed.

The basis for the restriction is that the process as claimed can be used to produce another and materially different product such as an optical preform. An optical preform is not a materially different product, but is in fact a product which is within the scope of the process of claim 1. In other words, the process of claim 1 can be used to make numerous porous bodies. Claim 1 is a linking claim, and claims 14 - 19, like claim 20, are all product-by-process claims dependent on this claim. Applicants could, for example, amend claim 1 by specifying "wherein the body having open ores [claim 14 - 19 language]" to place the subject matter of the dependent claims within claim 1 itself.

The claims define a single inventive concept, and an optical preform is not a materially different product, but rather is a product squarely within the range of products produced by the process of claim 1. Withdrawal of the restriction requirement is therefore solicited.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this application is requested. If the Examiner notes any minor errors, he is invited to telephone the undersigned so that the matter can be promptly handled by Examiner's amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Fritz Schwertfeger et al.

By: 

William G. Conger

Reg. No. 31,209

Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: Nov 21, 2006

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor

Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: (248) 358-4400; Fax: (248) 358-3351